

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action dated May 26, 2006. Claims 1-14 are pending. In the Office Action of May 26, 2006, the Examiner maintained the rejections to claims 1, 10-11 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Applicants admitted prior art (AAPA). The Examiner indicated claims 2-8, 12 and 14 included allowable subject matter, but claim 14 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

In this response, the Examiner's rejections of claims 1, 10, 11 and 13 are traversed below. Also, Applicants are submitting a replacement sheet of drawings with this response.

Applicants believe this response does not require the payment of additional fees, but authorize the payment of any required fees via deposit account 10-0460.

Amended Claim 1 and Claims 9-11 are Patentable

The Examiner rejected claim 1 as being anticipated by Applicants admitted prior art (AAPA), namely FIG. 1. The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection on the basis that claim 1 includes novel limitations not disclosed in the prior art.

Claim 1 recites that "each set of connection points comprises a *row of connection points* and each row of connection points is selected to connect via the plurality of traces to a slot that is a predetermined relative number of slots away from said slot." FIG. 1 (AAPA) does not disclose a backplane system with a row of connection points, where each row of connection points is selected to connect via a plurality of traces to a slot that is a predetermined relative number of slots away from that slot. As the Examiner recognizes, in the prior art shown in FIG. 1, row X of slot Y connects to row Y of slot X. Therefore, the connections in a particular row are not selected to connect one slot to another

slot a relative shift away from that slot. For example, consider the first row (104a). The connections in the first row (104a) and the third slot (102c) are with the third row (104c) and the first slot (102a), which is a relative shift of two. However, the connections in the same row (104a) for the fourth slot are with the fourth row (104d) and the first slot (102a), which is a relative shift of three, not two. Therefore the connections in each row of the prior art, namely FIG. 1, are not selected to connect the associated slots with slots a predetermined relative shift away. On the other hand, as illustrated by the embodiment shown in FIG. 2, each of the slot connections in the first row (204a) is a predetermined relative shift away from the connected slot. The predetermined relative shift for the first row of the embodiment shown in Fig. 2 is three. Therefore, each slot connects to a slot three shifts to the right.

Claim 1 is therefore patentable over the AAPA, at least because the AAPA fails to disclose novel features recited in the claims. And, claims 9-11, which depend from claim 1, are patentable for at least the reasons given for claim 1.

Claims 13 is Patentable

The Examiner rejected claim 13 as anticipated by AAPA, namely FIG. 1. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection on the basis that claim 13 includes certain limitations that are not included in AAPA. In particular, claim 13 requires, *inter alia*:

N-1 rows of connection points for interconnecting the N slots one to the other using the plurality of traces;

wherein each row of connection points is selected to connect a circuit pack in a slot to a slot that is a predetermined relative shift from said circuit pack.

As discussed above with respect to claim 1, AAPA fails to disclose a system where each row of connection points is selected to connect a circuit pack in a slot to a slot that is a predetermined relative shift from that circuit pack.

Hence, claim 13 is patentable. And, claim 14 is patentable in its present form, at least because it is dependent on claim 13.

Claims 2-8, 12 and 14 Include Patentable Subject Matter

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the indication that claims 2-8, 12 and 14 include patentable subject matter.

Replacement Sheet for Drawings

Submitted with this amendment is a replacement sheet of drawings to replace the second sheet of formal drawings. In the replacement sheet, FIG. 2 is amended to include a line from the transmitter (T) in row 1 (204a), slot 6 (202f) to the receiver (R) in row 1 (204a), slot 3 (202c). Support for this change in the drawings is found throughout the specification and drawings, and in particular, in FIG. 2 and in the specification, page 6, lines 20-28.

CONCLUSION

All pending claims are in condition for allowance. Allowance at an early date is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Reginald J. Hill
Registration No. 39,225
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Date: August 25, 2006

JENNER & BLOCK LLP
One IBM Plaza
Chicago, IL 60611
(312) 222-9350